

may simply be an appeasement, an attempt on the Dean's part to grease the squeakiest wheels in the Lecturer ranks.

Still, it is a positive move of sorts, another in a series of positive moves our Lecturers have witnessed over the past few years: first, full-year contracts; then benefits; then tiny across-the-board raises; now a few full-time continuing appointments with modest salary increases.

How have these changes come about? I would argue that they are a result of both Lecturer-initiated action and sustained faculty support for that action. Such support can take a number of forms, of course, including endorsement of the CCCC Statement. What I have described here is another kind of support: local support in the form of critical action research. With this kind of research we not only get to know our local academic communities, but we also create within those communities a context for positive change.

## Works Cited

- Carr, Wilfred, and Stephen Kemmis. *Becoming Critical: Knowing Through Action Research*. Victoria: Deakin University, 1983. [Originally an in-house publication of Deakin University in Australia, this book has since been revised, expanded, and published under the same title by Falmer Press in 1986.]
- Goswami, Dixie, and Peter R. Stillman, eds. *Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1987.
- Kincheloe, Joe L. *Teachers as Researchers: Qualitative Inquiry as a Path to Empowerment*. London: The Falmer Press, 1991.



## WPAs Assess the CCCC's "Statement of Principles and Standards"

Duncan Carter and Ben McClelland

**What Became of the Wyoming Conference Resolution:** In the summer of 1986 participants at the Wyoming Conference on Writing passed a resolution calling for redress of professional grievances suffered by writing teachers. In the spring of 1987, the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) accepted the resolution for consideration, charging a committee to prepare a document for adoption. Two years of committee deliberation, open meetings, and circulation of a draft document culminated in the CCCC's adoption of its "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing." (See CCCC Executive Committee in Works Cited.)

**The 1990 WPA Conference at Portland:** Writing program administrators have a special stake in the fate of the Wyoming Resolution and the subsequent CCCC's "Statement." Few are in a better tactical position to effect change in the working conditions and status of writing teachers, especially those in the academic underclass, which has grown dramatically since the early 1970's. However, WPAs generally lack the strategic programmatic and budgetary authority to act. With this paradox in mind, Chris Anderson and Duncan Carter hosted the annual WPA Conference in Portland, Oregon, in July, 1990, focusing on the issues raised by these two historic documents. Eighty-four WPAs from twenty-eight states joined in the professional dialogue at the conference, entitled "Status, Standards and Quality: The Challenge of Wyoming." The lively, occasionally heated, discussions revealed differing ideologies among WPAs as well as differing needs at various institutions, large and small, public and private. Enlightenment, not consensus, was the order of the day as conferees struggled with the knotty complex of fiscal, intellectual, and political issues involved.

Some conference participants focused specifically on the position of writing program administrators, which lead to the drafting of the Portland Resolution, a document that calls for just and reasonable status and working conditions for WPAs. In the years following the conference this resolution underwent a process of development within the Council of Writing Program Administrators similar to that of the Wyoming Resolu-

tion within CCCC. Christine Hult chaired the committee that deliberated on and revised the resolution. At its last meeting, the Council's Executive Committee adopted the document "Guidelines for Writing Program Administrator Positions," which is printed not coincidentally in this issue.

**The Continuing Dialogue Over Professional Standards:** The discussion at the conference revealed the need for such a document; yet the status of the WPAs, although a key issue, is still but one of the issues suggested by the CCCC "Statement." For the most part, the questions that dominated the 1990 conference remain the central questions of a continuing professional discussion. This article identifies those questions and captures the voices of conference participants as they pose answers. Reflecting on the questions raised and the ideas asserted at Portland, we insert "Authors' Comments" following some items. We also quote from the CCCC Committee's most recent statements, where pertinent, to update the discussion. For example, with Sharon Crowley as its current chair, the committee issued a progress report in the October 1991 issue of *College Composition and Communication*, in which it responded to criticism and clarified its position on "certain controversial aspects of the statement" (332). Bearing witness to the enduring and controversial nature of the issues raised at WPA's 1990 Portland Conference and discussed herein, five articles related to the CCCC's "Statement" also appear in the same issue of CCC, while the May 1992 issue of CCC carries the multiple-authored "Symposium on the 1991 Progress Report from the CCCC Committee on Professional Standards." (See Merrill in Works Cited.) Full implementation of the committee's recommendations would result in a significant change in the nature of CCCC as an organization; arguably, it would also greatly increase the pressure on writing program administrators across the country to improve writing teachers' working conditions. Thus, we present some of the dialogue over these issues here because we believe they continue to deserve wider discussion--and action.

## Ten Questions From the 1990 WPA Conference at Portland

1. **Can/should we claim rhetoric and composition as a legitimate field of scholarship?** Taking our profession seriously in the hope that others will too, the CCCC's "Statement" unequivocally announces, "Research in rhetoric and composition is a legitimate field of scholarship with standards comparable to other academic fields." Carol Hartzog saw this claim resting on the assumption that "Academic professions are of a type, within an

academy that continues much the same, and rhetoric and composition must show itself to be like them, a single and identifiable whole." But this assumption misrepresents the enormous variety within rhetoric and composition, in addition to ignoring many changes now taking place in other disciplines and in the academy at large. We come from different academic backgrounds, practice different methodologies and values, and work within a range of different institutional settings. Instead of trying to fit the traditional mold, Hartzog felt, we should acknowledge and affirm our own rich diversity, define ourselves much more broadly, and so position ourselves to "influence deeper changes in the academy."

James Sledd, who skeptically challenged the idea of making the claim to disciplinary status at all, characterized much of the research done in composition as either "piddling" or "wildly over-ambitious." Sledd saw the CCCC's "Statement" as a way "to placate the boss compositionists by admitting them to the worshipful company of privileged researchers," while allowing the exploitation of "contingent workers" and teaching assistants to continue unchecked.

If rhetoric and composition is to be viewed as a discipline, what kind of discipline is it? Ellen Strenski wondered whether composition should be thought of as "a separate discipline with its own research tradition and texts" or as "an enabling set of skills, attitudes, and techniques." Pointing to the CCCC's "Statement's" standard of "superior writing ability" for teaching assistants and part-time instructors (but not for tenure-track faculty), severe as the requirement of "research and publication in rhetoric and composition" for those on tenure track, Strenski concluded that "The CCCC's 'Statement' seems to want it both ways, with two corresponding streams of instructors."

Jim Slevin denied that the "Statement" encouraged any kind of two-tiered system; indeed, he saw the document as aimed at dismantling the two-tiered system now in place; however this reform and virtually any others we might wish are dependent on how we--and others--view our work. As Slevin contended, "We cannot separate considerations of institutional reform from considerations of how we define ourselves as a field and how our intellectual work--in our classrooms and in our scholarly journals--gets understood."

**Authors' comment:** If the study we conduct to understand our work and the writing we do to disseminate such knowledge are not scholarship, traditional or unconventional, what are they? For WPAs, the issue of what counts as research/scholarship continues to be problematized. Because it is so closely related to what counts toward tenure and promotion, the matter of scholarship in composition and rhetoric needs more profession-wide discussion and bears close observation on the local level.

**2. Must rhetoric and composition remain closely related to English departments?** The CCCC's "Statement" declares that "because of the significant intellectual and practical connections between writing and reading, composition and literature, it is desirable that faculty from both areas of specialization teach in the composition program." Together with the "Statement's" stance on graduate student assistants, this claim suggests a close and continuing link between writing programs and English departments. As Ellen Strenski observed,

The prospect, dramatized in the CCCC's 'Statement,' of writing instructors nestled in an English Department with traditional career paths—good graduate students to tenured professors via research and publication closely connected to literature—is a cozy picture. But there's a whole world out there of other kinds of writing [e.g. journalism, business correspondence, legal analysis, science and medical reportage, software]. These other kinds of writing seem to me to call for other institutional arrangements that acknowledge and reward the teaching of them, that is, other than the traditional scholarly publication model.

Noting the "symbiotic" relationship envisioned between composition and English studies, Carol Hartzog observed that "The administrative model suggested would suit some campuses: a writing program housed within or inextricably related to an English department. Other options, viable on some campuses, would be closed out or shut down. These include self-standing or interdisciplinary writing programs."

Ironically, self-standing programs sometimes have more power to improve working conditions than the kind of department the CCCC's "Statement" seems to envision. Virginia Polanski described her experience in an autonomous writing program, concluding, "I now have more freedom to move closer to the CCCC's 'Statement' . . . than I had as a member of an English department." If we are to remain in English departments, others argued, we are first going to have to overhaul them. Kristine Hansen began with Robert Scholes' view (in *Textual Power*) of the traditional English department, a hierarchy with literature and the consumption of texts on top, nonliterature and the production of texts on the bottom. Since the hierarchy is further divided into the "real" and the merely academic, we in composition are left to deal with the production of "pseudo-nonliterature." Gender mapping overlays this whole structure, with men dominant in

literature, women in pseudo-nonliterature. In short, if Scholes' structure is seen as a house, we are stuck in the basement. Hansen saw the CCCC's "Statement" as "a sketch of our remodeled dream house" but thought it remained to us to provide a more "specific blueprint." She presented specific recommendations for doing so within our own institutions: "Restructure the English major so undergraduates are exposed to courses in rhetorical theory and composition; hire only faculty with coursework in rhetoric and composition; place composition experts on search committees—and on tenure committees, to evaluate teaching."

**Authors' comment:** Administrative restructuring comes slowly to most campuses. While the matter of whether to stay within or to go outside the English Department seems more clearly delineated now than in the last decade, economic and political stagnation have brought budget cuts to many campuses and, along with them, a siege mentality that precludes serious consideration of long-term restructuring. Who can circulate a memo advocating a new program design when budget cuts have undermined the instructional integrity of the existing program? Some WPAs say that such a time is just right, however, for that sort of rethinking. Diligent and creative WPAs who are not daunted by the poor atmospheric conditions may seek change, but we wonder how many good, innovative program designs can be implemented during a period of insufficient funding. Working for more favorable structural arrangements will probably have to wait for budget lines to come alive once again. So what do we do in the meantime?

**3. Should national reform of teaching conditions be tied to the issue of tenure for writing teachers?** Carol Hartzog thought gains in professional status and tenure lines would be "important, but the need for improved conditions is so critical that it should not be fully dependent on them." Shelley Reece concurred, terming a shift from part-time instruction to faculty tenure lines "unrealistic" and "counter to a twenty-year trend." Jim Slevin acknowledged that a common response to the CCCC's document was to dismiss its insistence on tenure-line positions for writing faculty as unrealistic, unaffordable, even impossible. In particular, he spoke of the Association of Departments of English (ADE)'s resistance to the idea; however he also recounted what happened when he spoke at the annual convention of the Association of American Colleges. At one point, a dean acknowledged that "what was being proposed was in fact entirely affordable, that it represented a very tiny portion of any college or university's budget, and that there was no reason why the guidelines could not be realized within a few years." So what is the problem, then? According to Slevin, "The problem . . . is not that our demands are competing with lots

of other demands for resources; it is that our demands are not seriously in the competition . . . . Status and just support are denied not because the budget makes it impossible but because the intellectual power of writing courses is not apparent to [that dean] or to anyone else." Thus, Slevin argues, "political pressure to alter institutional practices" cannot be separated from the "intellectual argument about the need for change and the reconceptualizing of the aims of writing programs."

**Authors' comment:** Perhaps no single issue is more contested than the professional status of writing teachers. The financial needs of the underclass (part-time and temporary full-time faculty) are immediate and in many cases urgent. So, too, professional status for writing faculty as equal, tenurable colleagues with literature faculty is a long-standing need; while it may appear less urgent, it is essential to equitable treatment. Of individuals who have spoken publicly to this point, Robert Merrill strongly rejects the "Statement's" advocacy of tenure for writing teachers, arguing that the "Statement" "effectively calls for at least doubling the tenure-track positions in most departments," and adding that "those of you who can imagine this occurring in our lifetimes are the last true optimists" (155).

These issues are configured differently at private research institutions than at community colleges and at large versus small institutions. Can a single policy assist WPAs at all kinds of institutions? What is the optimal strategy, working for tenure lines or for smaller class sizes or for more money for part-time lines?

**4. Does an emphasis on tenure-track positions mean that individuals holding part-time or temporary positions should be replaced, even those who want to teach part-time?** While agreeing in principle that writing should be taught by tenure-line faculty, Carol Hartzog considered any wholesale conversion of positions to tenure track unlikely; however, she added that "to the extent that change does occur, some of the trauma of change will be felt by those undergoing review as their positions are transformed." Others were more direct in asserting that a move to tenure lines would cost many temporaries and part-timers their jobs. Lex Runciman and Kristine Hansen both thought about what might be done for in-house candidates when and if such a change were to take place. Runciman suggested several ways to make searches fair to in-house candidates. He wondered if we would continue to insist on the PhD as the *sine qua non* for tenure-track positions, and if not, what other criteria we might find appropriate, and how we might weight them. Aware that the scarcity of jobs during the 1970s and 1980s forced many well-qualified applicants to accept part-time, non-tenure track positions, he also urged us to be careful

not to "consciously or unconsciously penalize [in-house candidates] for demographics over which they've had no control."

Kristine Hansen suggested exploring "ways to help current part-time faculty qualify for the full-time, tenure-track jobs that might be created. If part-time faculty presently lack the credentials that would enable them to be hired to do much the same work they've been doing all along," she added, "I would hope that we could find ways to let their experience count towards a degree and find means to offer grants, leaves, and other assistance to enable them to qualify for greater responsibilities."

Many felt that the CCCC's "Statement," in its zeal to stamp out exploitation, is unnecessarily restrictive in recognizing only two legitimate reasons for hiring part-time writing faculty. Aren't there other legitimate reasons for wanting to teach part-time? What about the desire to maintain a professional identity--not to mention making some money--while one's children are small? Kristine Hansen suggested that we explore such options as job-sharing, dividing one tenure-line job between two people. Susan McLeod, who once worked part-time while raising children, agreed: "The full-time position is not everyone's ideal job at every stage in their lives." She also pointed out that spousal accommodation policies, especially at more remote institutions, made it essential for institutions to retain the flexibility to hire some faculty on a part-time basis or risk losing promising couples altogether. Elizabeth Hedengren, mother of five and by choice a part-time teacher for fourteen years, argued for "permanent part-time" status for those with doctorates. She explained, "When part-timers are fully qualified for regular full-time faculty [status] they would [under this option] have salary, fringe benefits and responsibilities prorated from the comparable professorial rank." She recommended similar opportunities for qualified teachers lacking the PhD, say, part-time lectureships or some other paraprofessional category, again with prorated salary, benefits, and responsibilities. Acknowledging that the status of part-timers is to some degree a women's issue, Hedengren asserted, "In any case . . . career part-timers who have taught for years and are professionally committed to teaching should not be overlooked."

**Authors' comment:** Responding to criticism "from persons who want to preserve the availability of part-time positions," the CCCC Committee on Professional Standards reasserts in its most recent statement the condemnation of what it considers abusive hiring practices. Aside from some "concessions to practical exigencies," the committee "remains convinced that the quality of writing instruction is not now served, and cannot ever be served, by its long-term association with teaching practices that we take to be exploitative . . . [W]e are forced to conclude that there is a connection . . . between the institutional status of writing instruction and

the hiring practices condemned in the statement" (CCCC Committee on Professional Standards 336). The Committee also addressed part-time teachers, distinguishing between those "who teach part-time because they must, in order to pay the rent and put bread on the table, and those who teach part-time because they choose to" (336-337). The Committee asked these latter individuals to "reconsider the far-reaching professional and political ramifications" of choosing to teach part-time, since "efforts to secure . . . support and [professional] recognition are hampered by the widespread use of part-time faculty to teach composition" (337).

**5. What about the continued reliance on teaching assistants?** Although the CCCC's "Statement" attempts to curb the abuse of graduate teaching assistants, many found the CCCC's "Statement" oddly tolerant of the use of teaching assistants in composition, while oddly intolerant of the use of part-time instructors, as if one were a form of exploitation and the other weren't. Some saw this imbalance as linked to the "Statement's" traditional view of writing programs as nestled comfortably within English departments. Leon Coburn also thought the reliance on TAs undercut the CCCC "Statement": although the "Statement" emphasizes professionalism, most TAs are trained as literature majors and are thus ill-equipped to teach writing. James Sledd observed that the Statement "would still allow the maintenance of armies of assistants," because they oversee the courses scorned by the professionals while filling their seminars. Slevin did not devote much attention to this issue, but he did say, "The reliance on graduate students as a source of cheap labor is clearly condemned in the document."

**Authors' comment:** Clarifying its position on TAs, the CCCC Committee on Professional Standards explains in its most recent statement that "[t]eachers of writing who are graduate students are entitled to compensation, benefits, class size, and course loads that are commensurate with the unusual and serious responsibility accorded them by the institution. They are entitled to adequate training in the teaching of writing and to careful supervision of their work. While their status as teachers-in-training does not, of course, accord them rights to promotion, tenure, and job security, efforts should be made to hire them in an ethically responsible manner and to provide them with frequent appraisals of their performance" (CCCC Committee on Professional Standards 336).

Still, some individuals are dissatisfied with the Committee's position on TAs. Eileen Schell asserts that "the CCCC's 'Progress Report' does not fully address the complexities of the GTA's position" (Merrill 165). She calls for the Committee to "further examine the complex double work situation that the GTA faces in his or her teaching responsibilities and academic work" (167).

**6. What can WPAs do to improve the lot of untenured instructors on our own campuses?** Perhaps the most creative answer to this question was provided by Shirley Rose, whose paper (with Susan Wyche-Smith) has since been published as "One Hundred Ways to Make the Wyoming Resolution a Reality." While some of the ways are more viable than others, the panelists advocate a positive-attitude, incremental approach: "Find one thing you can do, do it, then find another" (Wyche-Smith and Rose 319). Nineteen of the ways were WPA-specific, including these two:

57. Make certain writing-program administrative work is recognized as both "teaching" and "service" for purposes of released-time assignments, tenure evaluation, and departmental benefits. (See the "Statement" and the "Report of the Modern Language Association's Commission on Writing and Literature" [*Profession 88*: 70-76].)

75. Set aside one day a week or some kind of regular work time, however brief, for your own scholarly work. (Wyche-Smith 322-23)

William Irmscher approved, stating, "the changes that have occurred (over the years) are due primarily to the efforts of respected individuals on individual campuses, not to reform movements or government programs . . . . In such personal actions lies the hope for those who will continue to shape the development of composition studies in the future." Others contributed to a growing list of creative problem-solving suggestions for individual and collective action. Here is a sampling:

- Bruce Leland suggested involving instructors in collaborative authorship of texts used in the writing program. This improves morale by giving instructors real responsibility for the content of the program and can lead to collective action directed at other issues of concern to instructors.

- Kim Flachmann involves instructors in the administration of the writing program, to include serving on subcommittees, coordinating departmental exams, and authoring sections of the writing program handbook. She has also finagled a \$25/hour "consultant fee" for these professional responsibilities.

- Elizabeth Nist and Suzanne Webb argued that WPAs who want to effect real change must learn more about both the budgeting process and the mindset of administrators.

- Shelley Reece urged that we follow the ten recommendations for part-timers in our own departments, that WPA consultant-evaluators apply

those same recommendations when conducting external evaluations of other writing programs, and that part-timers be represented on the CCCC Executive Board.

Specifically, how can the "Statement" be useful in this much-needed work of improving the lot of writing instructors on our own campuses? James Slevin said that this document should "enable but not require writing faculty to press for improvements in their situation. The aim was to give them as clear and forceful a statement as possible from which to negotiate for changes at their institutions, if they chose to do so. It was to be a statement of policy, and as such was to make clear those conditions that could be taken as the rights of any faculty member." Most of the WPAs assembled in Portland agreed on the value of the CCCC's "Statement." As Susan McLeod put it, "Such documents speak with some authority to administrators." In addition, they represent an ideal for us to struggle toward. "We should take these documents not as blueprints, but as exhortations to try to do our best for our profession and for those employed in it."

**7. How can the status of WPAs be enhanced so they are in a better position to effect some of these changes?** The WPA is, on most campuses, the logical person to champion the kinds of changes envisioned by the CCCC's "Statement." Unfortunately, the WPA is just as likely to be a 97-pound weakling, ill-equipped to kick sand in anyone's face. Karen Vaught-Alexander described her experiences as a new WPA; Thomas Recchio and Lynn Z. Bloom identified various of the "initiation rites" to which the new WPA is traditionally subjected. The two representations gained added authority by being in such perfect accord with each other:

Recchio and Bloom: Rite #1. Something important that you've been promised will not be ready when you arrive new on the job, like an office, a computer, a salary check . . . . Rite #2. Whatever you anticipated your duties to be, they will be expanded . . . . Rite #3. The funding for a major program you anticipated running will be curtailed drastically or wiped out entirely . . . .

Vaught-Alexander: My actual job description has been in flux since last year. After MLA, I accepted a position for which I would train peer tutors, run a writing center, develop a WAC program, and teach a half-load. By April, my duties also included help-

ing to develop the Freshman seminar program for Fall 1990. By July, I was told there was no space or funding for the writing center and tutors but that there was plenty to do, indeed. Indeed.

Recchio and Bloom went on to argue that these "rites," if taken as openings for dialogue, can lead to meaningful change--not just change in the WPA's role or status, but change in the community as a whole. Change was also a major concern of Vaught-Alexander, who found the CCCC's "Statement" an important guide both for evaluating university policy and for proposing change.

How others view composition specialists in general and WPAs in particular can be inferred from the *MLA Job Information List*, argued Joseph Janangelo. Janangelo found four categories of jobs in the *JIL*: the WPA, the generalist, those with ancillary interests, and lecturer/instructorships. In his estimate, ads for jobs in all four categories "undermine the intended professionalism of writing faculty, misrepresent our work, and have the potential to keep us further 'marginalized' in the academy." Especially interesting were ads that require grounding in a traditional literary field as well as in rhetoric and composition--"just in case all this writing stuff goes bust." Christine Hult agreed that many WPAs find themselves lacking the authority to fulfill their responsibilities, while their service goes unrewarded and their research unsupported. To address these problems, she proposed a statement of "Principles and Standards for the WPA Position," a document analogous to the CCCC's "Statement" but limited to WPAs. The statement would have two parts, the first, "Working Conditions Necessary for Quality Writing Program Administration," the second, "Guidelines for Developing WPA Job Descriptions." Others had been thinking along the same lines. Kathleen Kelly and the other participants in the 1990 WPA Workshop session had already produced a draft of a document they call "The Portland Resolution," a statement addressing the same problem.

**Authors' comment:** See the result of this labor in the "Guidelines for Writing Program Administrator Positions," adopted by our Executive Committee and reprinted in this issue. Our organization is fortunate to have such a useful document to guide job-development negotiations. We are all indebted to Christine Hult and the committee members who developed it, yet, we have much to learn as individuals begin to use it in practical deliberations at their institutions. For some lessons on how WPAs might acquire and use power, see Ed White's "Use It or Lose It: Power and the WPA" (*WPA* 15.1-2 [1991]: 3-12).

**8. Should WPA consultant/evaluators somehow enforce the CCCC principles and standards on their campus visits?** Lynn Z. Bloom and Ben McClelland addressed this question in a session moderated by Edward M. White. Bloom urged caution, whether the issue were endorsement of the CCCC's "Statement" by the WPA or enforcement of its principles by consultant/evaluators. The "Statement" calls for comparable pay (per course) when part-time faculty have duties and credentials comparable to those of full-time faculty, but as a general rule, though, the duties and credentials of part-time and full-time faculty never are really comparable. Another problem is the "Statement's" call for no more than 10% of a department's offerings to be taught by part-time faculty. Administrators are more likely to ignore this guideline than to conform to it, simply because conforming costs money. Finally, programs relying primarily on teaching assistants are "largely exempt" from the strictures of the CCCC's "Statement," allowing these institutions to "claim moral superiority" even though relying on TAs "reinforces the *de facto* use of part-time teachers, and thus further undercut the Wyoming Conference Resolution." For these and other reasons, Bloom believed that WPA consultant/evaluators should not attempt to enforce these standards at the institutions they visit. To do so would cause their evaluations to be disregarded as unrealistic at best, and at worst hypocritical, since consultant/evaluators often come from institutions that also violate these standards.

McClelland countered with a position that favored advocacy but not enforcement, of the principles and standards in the "Statement." He encouraged WPA consultant/evaluators to work with an institution to address issues of noncompliance and to help develop a long-range plan for coming into compliance with the "Statement." McClelland argued for an ideal professional status for both literature and writing teachers in an English faculty, one that was "not so much a faculty homogeneity or even unity, but pluralism--faculty and program heterogeneity without hierarchy." Realizing that this might be too much to ask in the short run, McClelland called "at least for real steps now to eliminate the severe professional inequities that exist between literary study and writing instruction." To achieve this, he called for "more public advocacy of the cause of professional standards and quality education." The panelists agreed that the "Statement" would make a useful appendix to a report.

**9. What became of the second and third of the original charges contained in the Wyoming Conference Resolution?** James Sledd raised this question most eloquently. Of the three charges in the Wyoming Resolution, the first called for professional standards, the second for a grievance procedure, and the third for "a procedure for acting upon a finding of noncompliance."

The CCCC's "Statement" fulfills only the first of these charges. According to Sledd, when Jim Slevin's task force recommended to the CCCC Executive Committee that the CCCC not become involved in censuring institutions, "By that one refusal to act, the two committees reduced their joint effort to more talk about exploitation . . . ." Of course, concluded Sledd, it was inevitable that Parts Two and Three be derailed: "They posed a threat to the system of exploitation without which English Departments in their present state could not exist, the system from which administrators, literati, and compositionists all profit." Slevin noted that "the CCCC Executive Committee did not fully encourage all three directives, but the Wyoming Resolution Committee has in fact kept them firmly in mind and has developed plans for implementing all three." He acknowledged that it had "taken more time than I would have liked" but that the groundwork for Parts Two and Three had been laid. He explained that in November, 1989, the CCCC Executive Committee unanimously approved three initiatives relevant to Part Two: (1) establishing a caucus "for all [CCCC] members interested in reforming the teaching of writing in accordance with CCCC guidelines" (among other things, this caucus will sponsor workshops at annual CCCC conventions, preparing individuals to promote change on their own campuses); (2) training CCCC Regional Advisors "to facilitate change at institutions other than their own," and (3) training CCCC Mediators, who "will respond to requests to meet with parties involved in negotiating better practices on particular campuses, helping to resolve conflict." With Regional Advisors and Mediators, "the mechanism for receiving grievances and responding to them" is in place. Part Three, which calls for a procedure for acting upon a finding of noncompliance (specifically, a way of censuring institutions), is sufficiently serious and sufficiently expensive to warrant caution. If we are to proceed after the fashion of the AAUP, we will need lawyers, staff, and so on: in short, money, so we can expect our CCCC dues to shoot up. Then, too, "CCCC has to determine exactly what noncompliance will mean [when] maybe half of the colleges and universities in the country currently depart from its guidelines."

**Authors' comment:** Notwithstanding such dramatic calls as Sledd's for immediate action against institutions in noncompliance with the "Statement," mechanisms for mediating and sanctioning are a long way off. They are both costly and time-consuming. The CCCC Committee on Professional Standards recently elaborated on its position on these procedures. In sum, before and in order for mediation to take place, the standards in question must be "incorporated into whatever governance documents operate" at a given institution. As for censure, "the sign of failure to mediate conflict," CCCC has not yet determined whether to follow the AAUP example. Nevertheless, the Committee says that CCCC needs "both

immediate and long-term help from its membership in order to begin implementation and enforcement of the second and third provisions of the Wyoming Resolution." The help called for includes case studies of implementation, an understanding of "noncompliance" as "resistance to change," and "a graduated dues structure to raise funds to support implementation and enforcement of the standards" (CCCC Committee on Professional Standards 340-42).

**10. What will happen to this statement in the face of changes in student and faculty demographics in the 1990s?** Looking to the recent past, several noticed that demographic projections are just as likely to be abused (or simply wrong) as to be heeded. Jim Slevin, for example, pointed to the "systematic erosion" of faculty lines between 1972 and 1986. During that period, the percentage of English PhDs finding tenure-track jobs dwindled to 40% (from 93%), all in the name of flexibility in the face of projected declines in student enrollment; in fact, during this same period, student enrollment actually increased. Despite the "turnaround" in the job market predicted by some, Shelley Reece was skeptical about the prospects of moving, after a brief transitional period, from part-time and temporary full-time appointments to tenure-track appointments. This would run counter to the trend during the past decade. However, Lex Runciman thought this "turnaround" in the job market might "force departments to reconsider the whole matter of staffing writing courses (including class size, pay, and type of appointment), for only by doing so will they be able to attract and keep the teachers they need for writing courses each term." In other words, current demographics play into the hands of the CCCC's "Statement" rather than working counter to it.

**Conclusion:** The concerns of conferences past have a way of dissipating. Not so for the issues raised at WPA's conference in Portland more than two years ago. If the issue of principles and standards for postsecondary teaching of writing is not at the top of your agenda, we wonder why it isn't. If it is, we wonder how it is so? The discussion needs to continue and to be recontextualized in today's terms, in light of the continuing work of the CCCC's Committee on Professional Standards and in light of the issuance of WPA's "Guidelines for Writing Program Administrator Positions." Moreover, these issues have many local variables that push against one resolution for WPAs in various situations. As individual WPAs initiate local discussions of these documents, they can benefit from experiences such as that of Chris Anson and Greta Gaard, who describe one interesting model for implementing the reforms recommended in the "Statement" (Merrill 171-5). Furthermore, some feel that certain aspects of our work are

not sufficiently addressed in the "Statement," for instance writing centers. Valerie Balester argues that the "current wording of the 'Statement' falls short of addressing the true working conditions in writing centers" and "presents an image of writing centers as supplemental to the English Department curriculum" (Merrill 167).

Perhaps we would benefit from another look at these documents and their histories at a future WPA conference.

## Works Cited\*

- Bloom, Lynn Z. "'Yes, but . . .': The Wyoming Conference Resolution: Bludgeons, Barriers, and Gaps."
- Bloom, Lynn Z., and Thomas E. Recchio. "Initiation Rites, Initiation Rights." Since published in *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 14.1-2 (1991): 21-26.
- CCCC Committee on Professional Standards. "A Progress Report from the Committee on Professional Standards." *College Composition and Communication* 42 (1991): 330-44.
- CCCC Executive Committee. "Statement of Principles and Standards for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 40 (1989): 329-36.
- Coburn, Leon. "The English Graduate Student as Writing Teacher."
- Flachmann, Kim. "A Sense of Responsibility: The Key to Self-Esteem for Part-Time and Full-Time Temporary Faculty."
- Hansen, Kristine. "Textual Power, Institutional Power, and the Teaching of Composition."
- Hartzog, Carol. "The Lure of Professionalism."
- Hedengren, Elizabeth. "Permanent Part-Time Faculty: A Non-Exploitative Option for Career Part-Timers."
- Hult, Christine. "On Being a Writing Program Administrator." Served as the basis for WPA's "Guidelines for Writing Program Administrator Positions."
- Irmscher, William F. Remarks. Featured Panel.

- Janangelo, Joseph. "Somewhere between Disparity and Despair: Writing Program Administrators, Image Problems, and the MLA Job Information List" Since published, *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 15.1-2 (1991): 60-66.
- Leland, Bruce. "Do-It-Yourself: Writing a Program-Specific Textbook."
- McClelland, Ben W. "Up Front: The Crucial Place of the Wyoming Conference Resolution for Consultant/Evaluators."
- McLeod, Susan. Remarks. Featured Panel.
- Merrill, Robert, Thomas J. Farrell, Eileen E. Schell, Valerie Balester, Chris M. Anson, and Greta Gaard. "Symposium on the 1991 'Progress Report from the CCCC Committee on Professional Standards.'" *College Composition and Communication* 43 (1992): 154-175.
- Nist, Elizabeth. "Demystifying the Budget."
- Polanski, Virginia G. "We Are Autonomous: An Argument for a Separate Writing Department."
- Reece, Shelley. "We Hold These Truths . . . : Part-Time Teachers, Standards and Guidelines, and the Profession."
- Rose, Shirley K. "Return to Wyoming: Revision and Restoration of Resolve." Since published; see Wyche-Smith and Rose below.
- Runciman, Lex. "The Wyoming Resolution and Questions of Hiring from Within."
- Sledd, James. "Old Racket as New Paradigm; or, New Feet in the Old Trough."
- Slevin, James. "The Wyoming Resolution in Context: Where It Came From, Where It Is Going." Since published, in part, as "Depoliticizing and Politicizing Composition Studies," in Richard Bullock and John Trimbur (eds.) *The Politics of Writing Program Instruction: Postsecondary*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1991.
- Strenski, Ellen. "The Professional Standard of 'Superior Writing Ability': Problems of Definition and Just Application across Ranks, the Recruitment of Composition Instructors, and the Evaluation of Teaching."
- Vaught-Alexander, Karen. "'The New Kid at School': The Challenges of the Wyoming Resolution for a New WPA in a New Writing Program."
- Webb, Suzanne. "Cleaning a Dean and Other Tales of the Macabre."
- Wyche-Smith, Susan, and Shirley K. Rose. "One Hundred Ways to Make the Wyoming Resolution a Reality: A Guide to Personal and Political Action." *College Composition and Communication* 41 (October 1990): 318-24.

\*Except where otherwise noted, all works cited are papers delivered at the 1990 WPA Summer Conference, Portland, Oregon, 26-28 July.

